



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Jose by 't: out with 't! within ten year it will make itself ten, which is a goodly increase," and *Sonnet* vi (for this symbolic use of the number ten, see also xxxii, and xxxviii),

"That's for thyself to breed another thee,
Or ten times happier, be it ten for one;
Ten times thyself were happier than thou art,
If ten of thine ten times refigur'd thee."

Moreover it might be argued that the figure of gluttony is changed in the next following sonnets into that of the thriftless waste of him who would be "the tomb of his self-love to stop posterity" (iii), "beauty's waste" being beauty "kept unus'd," for "the user so destroys it" (ix).

That commentators are in the main agreed in regarding the compound phrase "by the grave and thee" as a modifier of the verb "eat," in the sense indicated, would require no further notice if one did not find an interest in the variety of the expression of the same sense; this interest is also increased by an agreement among commentators that the lines under consideration require elucidation, although the explanation given is usually represented as being sufficiently obvious. Steevens's conjecture "be thy grave and thee" is indeed exceptional in acknowledging a grammatical difficulty; but before turning to that aspect of the problem, a few more of the notes accordant with those already cited may be added. Delius says, "*this* [glutton] bezieht sich auf das Folgende: ein solcher Schlemmer, dass Du, vermittelst des Grabes and Deiner selbst, das aufzehrst, was der welt zukommt;" and Wyndham's exposition is, "*Pity the world*, of which you are the present ornament and only earnest of future increase in beauty (9-10), *or else* prevent the confirmation of that earnest, which is due to the world, by *the grave* (=your death) and *thee* (=your refusal to propagate your beauty before dying)."

The grammatical difficulty which Steevens, without success, attempted to remove is a barrier to the acceptance of the usual interpretation of these lines. To allow the grammatical construction to suggest the sense, is, as it is in most cases, probably better than to break the grammar upon the wheel of a preconceived notion of the sense. In this instance the grammatical construction requires "by the grave and thee" to restrict "due." The preposition "by" (which alone occasions the obscurity) is here used with perhaps a remote suggestion of the idiom 'to have children by';

but its meaning, aside from suggestiveness of this sort, is primarily, perhaps, that of instrumentality in establishing and in owing an obligation, with a possible implication of 'at the hands of.' "The world's due (at the hands of, or owed) by the grave and thee," therefore represents briefly what I believe the intended meaning to be. This debt which is due the world is reverted to in the fourth sonnet, with a natural change of the figure which confirms the sense of the earlier lines.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

FRENCH LYRICS.

French Lyrics, selected and edited with an introduction and notes by ARTHUR GRAVES CANFIELD. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1899. 8vo, pp. 382.

THERE has certainly been a great need and a large place open for a text-book or a selection of French lyric poetry, and Prof. Canfield's book comes to us at an opportune time. The demands on such a text-book, if it is to be successful, are many and difficult. Inasmuch as the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries are the great ages of lyricism in French literature, the introduction would naturally contain a comprehensive, yet quite brief, outline of the development of lyricism in these centuries: the causes, conditions and influences under which lyric poetry was developed, and a statement of the principal questions of versification as they grew and changed from one school to the other. Sixteenth Century lyricism would naturally be well represented. Does Prof. Canfield's *French Lyrics* cover these demands?

It is intended as "an introduction to the reading and study of French lyric poetry," and in a general way to show that France, too, "possesses a wealth of lyric poetry." Of the twenty-two pages of the Introduction, fifteen are devoted to a very general sketch of lyric poetry from its origins to the present day; the remaining seven treat of versification. It is needless to say that such an introduction cannot pretend to give even the general reader much of a notion of what French lyric poetry is, and those who are likely to use the book (the teachers of French in our colleges) will not expect an exhaustive treatise. So many of our modern text-books deal too much with glittering, flowery generalities, instead of giving the student for whose benefit they are

really written some digestible food. There is nothing to object to in this Introduction. It is well written and attractive; but is it what the student wants? There are over three hundred pages of selections and surely these would warrant a thorough presentation of the history of lyricism. Under the list of anthologies there might be added a very helpful one, G. Merlet, *Anthologie classique des Poètes du XIX^{ème} Siècle* (Lemerre), containing especially fine selections of the more modern poets. As to the notes on versification, they seem entirely too general to be of much use, and appear to be picked up at random without logical sequence. After a page of generalities such as "the rules of French versification have not always been the same" or "in determining the number of syllables the general rules of syllabic division are followed, and each vowel or diphthong involves a syllable,"

the rules of mute *e* and hiatus are stated; another page of generalities on the alexandrine, followed by a few rules or statements on rime. It is hardly true that the Romanticists especially have cultivated rich rime; the Parnassians have this honor. An explanation of the *ballade*, *rondel*, *rondeau*, *triolet* and *sonnet* follows.

Of the three hundred pages of selections only thirty are devoted to poems before the Nineteenth Century. If the object of the book is to show that France possesses a wealth of lyric verse, to make this more widely known, and to stimulate an interest in French lyricism, the reviewer fears the reader will have a very unfair impression of French lyric poetry before this century. In reading over the names of authors one is surprised to find so many obscure names and not to find some of the finest lyric poets of the younger generation. From the vast number of this century's poets the editor has chosen about fifty; more than a dozen of these can hardly claim a place in so limited a number. Names such as Agoult, Arnault, Arvers, Chateaubriand, Bourget, Boutelleau, Frémire, Lafenestre, Maupassant, Millevoye, Nodier, Tiercelin, do not deserve a place in a book whose purpose is to acquaint the reader with the best *lyric* poets. If Chateaubriand is important in the development of lyricism, Mme de Staël, Sainte-Beuve, Catulle Mendès, Mallarmé, Richepin, and Rollinat are so also; they represent certain tendencies. If

you admit Daudet, Maupassant, and Bourget, why omit Lemaitre and France? No anthology that attempts at all to give an idea of this century's lyricism should fail to omit selections from such sane, healthy and exquisite poetry as that of Eugène Manuel, Gabriel Vicaire, Jean Aicard, Louis Ratisbonne, Auguste Dorchain, etc., the cream of the later Nineteenth Century lyricists whose names and poetry are familiar to every French schoolboy. It is true the impression prevailing among the uninitiated is that the beauty of French lyricism lies in its form and nudity (coldness, lack of sympathy, immorality). Those who will resort to this book will already be familiar with Lamartine, Victor Hugo, Musset, de Vigny and Leconte de Lisle; besides we already have selections from these poets. Now if one out of every three of these poets selected have only written one poem worth writing and recording, what an impression this will leave with the reader! He will certainly imagine a great dearth of real lyric poets in this century, of course, outside of the five great poets. There is a wealth of genuine, healthy and exquisite lyricism written within the last thirty years, and this is hardly touched by Prof. Canfield. So few people are acquainted with it and it is difficult to find. The reviewer believes it the duty of such a work as that now before us to bring such poets as Manuel, Ratisbonne, etc., before our American public. Why allot forty pages to Victor Hugo, over thirty to Musset and as many to Lamartine, or nearly one-third of the entire space? Leconte de Lisle is not widely read nor well-known in America, and the average reader finds great difficulty in appreciating his poems without guiding notes. A few of the exquisite, short *Chansons Ecossaises* in the *Poèmes Barbares* would have been relished by the reader, as they are such a contrast to the other poems.

There are some sixty pages of notes: under the name of each author there will be found a few very general remarks on the character of the poet and his works, with the names of some of his works, now and then a few references to criticisms, and finally notes on the text. The usefulness of such lines as the following, and there are fully a dozen similar specimens, seems very doubtful:

"An enormous literary force at the beginning of this century; M. E. Faguet calls him the 'greatest date in French letters since the

Pleiad'. But the instrument of his power was prose. His attempts in verse were poor. Yet he exercised a direct influence towards the renewal of lyric poetry as has been indicated in the introduction." (Cf. Chateaubriand.)

The reviewer would like to have seen all of this general information-space used in the Introduction for a thorough, yet brief, treatise on French lyricism. There are a number of very excellent features to the book, such as the selections from the greater poets, with a few notes and references for further study. The book is admirably gotten up, and is a credit to the publishers. Whether this book will prove useful to the teachers of French, who are willing to offer a course on lyric poetry, remains for each one to decide for himself. For the poetry earlier than the Nineteenth Century it is entirely inadequate; for the lyricism of the first half of the century it is excellent as far as selections go; the later poets and schools can hardly be said to be represented. The usefulness of the book to our colleges and universities is limited, it seems to the reviewer, to a course in Romantic lyricism. For this it is excellent; but more than this cannot be said in its praise. To the general reader Prof. Canfield's *French Lyrics* may be useful; yet there is a certain danger of claiming a wrong impression and of getting an inadequate idea of French lyric poetry because of the defects which have been pointed out.

HUGO P. THIEME.

University of Michigan.

ÆSOPIC FABLES.

The Isopo Laurenziano, edited with notes and an introduction by MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH (Johns Hopkins dissertation). Columbus: 1899. 8vo, pp. viii+186.

THE first part of Dr. Brush's dissertation consists of a description of twenty-seven manuscripts containing Italian fable collections older than the sixteenth century, with a discussion of their relations to each other and to their respective sources. The presentation of the subject is the best and most nearly complete that has yet been published. The previous writers who have given the most information, Ghivizzani and Hervieux, are neither so full nor so accurate as Dr. Brush; his work rests largely on personal investigations in the libraries of Italy, where are found all but two of the manu-

scripts described, and it is in part new and original.

The twenty-seven manuscripts "which contain what may be properly called fable collections, or parts thereof" (p. 4) include two (Nos. 9 and 17) which have respectively five and three fables. Among these fables, which are in *terza rima*, two are common to the two manuscripts, in similar but not identical wording. It is very much to be wished that Dr. Brush had published these six different fables, as Ghivizzani proposed to do; they seem to have been influenced by other sources than those of the ordinary collections.¹ The same is true of MS. 22, a copy of the *Libro della Virtù* containing sixteen fables. Dr. Brush judges that for these fables "the author drew on various collections as he saw fit" (p. 42). One might go further, and say that some of the fables come directly from popular tradition. This is probably true of "Come la Cornacchia si vesta dell' altrui Penne," which, as may be seen from the title alone, did not come from any collection of the Phædrus-Romulus family, but from some popular source, like the "Exemplo de la Cornacla com' ela se visti," in the *Libro de li Exempla* published by Ulrich.² The latter collection, by the way, with its four fables, seems entitled to admission in the list as well as the *Libro della Virtù*; neither of them is primarily a collection of fables. As to what constitutes a "part of a collection," Dr. Brush makes a nice distinction when he excludes a manuscript containing two fables (cf. note on p. 6), and admits another containing only three. His list of collections is nearer completeness than any previous one. Of his twenty-seven manuscripts, fifteen are mentioned by Ghivizzani, and a few more by Hervieux; three have been cited by no previous writer. We note with pleasure that Dr. Brush proposes to continue his work in this field, and to republish the fifteenth century Accio Zuccho collection, which is contained in one

¹ It would be particularly interesting to compare the *Fox and Wolf in Well*, which occurs in both manuscripts, with similar fables, such as the one in the *Roman de Renart*. Dr. Brush is in error (p. 40, note) in thinking Regnier's reference to Verdizotti a blunder; in an edition before me, *Cento Favole Bellissime*, Venetia, 1661, No. 12 is *La Volpe e' l' Lupo*; it is, however, different from either of the two fables of La Fontaine (iii, 5; xi, 6) which treat a similar subject, and also from Phædrus iv, 9. On the *Lion, Fox, Sheep and Wolf*, cf. Gjsaki, *Fabel vom Löwenanthell*, Berlin, 1888, pp. 50-59.

² First in *Romania*, xiii, 47, then in *Trattati Religiosi*, Bologna, 1891. On this fable and its two forms, cf. Fuchs, *Fabel von der Krähe*, Berlin, 1886; and my article, *A Sennet ascribed to Chiaro Davanati*, in *Pub. of the Mod. Lang. Assoc. of Am.*, Vol. xiii, pp. 205-220.